

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13213

in another that he is a warmonger. The truth, of course, is that he is neither of these—as we suspect most of his critics well realize.

# IMPRISONMENT OF MARTIN LUTHER KING IN ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we face a strange anomaly in the fact that Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., until today continues to be in jail in St. Augustine, Fla., subject to a charge of trespass, his crime consisting of the fact, that he sought to be served at a restaurant "in a segregated motel."

Lately, I have been listening to a great deal of advice being given the people of the State of New York, which I have not resented, but have instead appreciated, because we will listen to it seriously, and if we believe it is good advice, we shall take it.

As Florida is also a part of the United States, of course, I believe it is well to ask the people of a State like Florida to bethink themselves of their own situation. The argument is being made that there is deep concern in the country over the protest against the deprivation of civil rights. Even spokesmen from that area of the country are willing to admit that the pending civil rights bill will probably be enacted into law.

The pending bill contains a standard which is exactly the opposite of the standards by which Rev. Martin Luther King—who is acknowledged to be perhaps the single leading individual in the whole Negro community in the United States—is being imprisoned; yet, we see this strange paradox of the continuance of his imprisonment in the face of what seems to be a broad consensus, that a man, even if he is a Negro, should be entitled to be served in a motel.

I trust that much thought will be given to this question and that in the interests of peace, tranquility and moderation it would even be in order to determine whether State laws like the one under which Reverend King is held—which are, in my judgment, unconstitutional, and which certainly will run afoul of the standard which will, without too much question, soon become the national standard—should nonetheless continue to be enforced at a time like this—as if people lived on another planet.

I suggest only that, and submit it, because it does seem so anomalous to me—and I believe to many other Americans—as we read the papers and hear the arguments taking place in the Senate, that to this very moment Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., remains in jail because he is a Negro in applying at a motel to be served and was refused service on the ground, as frankly stated by the manager that his motel was segregated. He should be released now.

# LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE OREGONIAN ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a penetrating article written by Dr. Remy W. Fulsher, of Portland, Ore.,

may be printed in the RECORD. The letter rightly takes the Oregonian to task for an editorial on Indochina. It is a sound criticism.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 1, 1964.

THE EDITOR,  
The Oregonian,  
Portland, Ore.

DEAR SIR: I am writing in reference to your "Anti-U.S. Ally" editorial, presenting France as a "friend of Red China."

The matter of "hot pursuit," where armed forces violate the frontiers of a sovereign country and kill unarmed civilians, is obviously wrong under international law. When the French did this in Tunisia, your newspaper was against it, so was Ambassador Lodge in the U.N. who voted with the Communists against the French, at the time. Perhaps you and Ambassador Lodge have changed your minds. Apparently the U.N. has not. Or do you still support the U.N.?

It was not "ineptitude" which caused the French to lose the war in Indochina and to let the country be partitioned. Following the collapse of a coalition of United Nations in North Korea, resulting in permanent partition of Korea, enormous quantities of military supplies, especially artillery, and volunteers from China, were deployed against the French. Partition of the country was suggested by the U.S. Government (Eisenhower) who pledged support to the anti-French Ngo Dien and presumably to his sister-in-law, Emperor Bao Dai's music teacher, Mme. Nhu.

When you say that France is "a friend of Red China," I think that you are placing yourself in the same category with extremists who have called everybody—Eisenhower, Kennedy, Morse, etc.—Communists. This, in my opinion, is unpardonable.

If you go to the effort of reviewing the history of French-Cambodian relations, you will find that France has never "let that country drift." Cambodia, the remnant of the ancient Khmer empire, was saved from extinction at the hands of her neighbors, the Siamese and the Annamites, by the French. Cambodia was never a French colony but a protectorate. In the Indochinese war, the Royal Cambodian Contingent fought loyally alongside the French to the end against the common Communist enemy. Today, Cambodia is still a very pro-French constitutional monarchy. It is not a dictatorship. Private property there has not been nationalized. The country has managed to remain free from the ravages of war thanks to its popular Chief of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk. Prince Norodom Sihanouk no longer accepts American aid following alleged attempts by the CIA to depose him. Perhaps he has let himself be influenced by the words of Mme. Nhu, "If you have America for a friend, you don't need any enemies."

If you publish this letter, please do not edit it or delete parts of it.

Sincerely,

REMY W. FULSHER, M.D.  
PORTLAND, OREG.

# THE PROBLEM OF VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a penetrating article written by Eliot Janeway and published in the Chicago Tribune on March 19, 1964, may be printed in the RECORD. It is entitled "Viets Not in World Stream of Economics." It is an excellent article.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 19, 1964]  
VIETS NOT IN WORLD STREAM OF ECONOMICS  
(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, March 18.—The decision of New Hampshire Republicans: "We'll take Lodge," raises issues outside the partisan orbit of domestic politics. The sore and troubled problem of Vietnam has been haunting American opinion for years. Lodge's victory brings it to the surface.

Is Vietnam another Korea? Is it a second chance at the gamble that didn't come off there? Or is it a muddy morass, waiting to swallow troops and equipment, hopes and policies, time without end?

Now that the Lodge candidacy is sharpening the smoldering anxiety over Vietnam, there's bound to be greater pressure for a decision.

There are times and places, however, when it's the better part of valor to hold back from irretrievable decisions. Certainly, we don't want to concede Vietnam to the Communists. Nor do we want to send our boys into a beartrap.

In any policy consideration of the risk-reward ratio of all-out U.S. commitment in Vietnam, it's understandable that many Americans should confine their thinking to Vietnam alone. But the decision whether to draw a line in our confrontation with Soviet imperialism, and to hold it, is bigger than any single trouble spot in Asia.

# IS IT PLACE TO FIGHT?

Certainly, there's no suggestion of appeasement or dealing from weakness if we stop to ask ourselves: Is Vietnam the right front for us to fight on? Or would we be canner to bait a trap of our own in terrain better suited to the mobilization of our resources?

Lodge's late boss, John Foster Dulles, urged us to operate from what he described as "situations of strength"; so that we might confront the enemy at times and places of our choosing, not his. Here's one suggested standard for determining where the United States is stronger, and where Soviet imperialism is weaker.

# A STRANGE FAILURE

The standard is economic—that is, it is on the economic front that our strength is overwhelmingly greater than our enemy's. But we have never learned to mobilize it fully against Moscow and Peking. This is a strange failure in view of the decisive role played by American economic power in winning World War II against economies that were more formidable than the Soviets are today.

Stated baldly, there is little fighting our economy can do for us in Vietnam. Vietnam has yet to be drawn into the world economic stream. The only power we can bring to bear on that tormented region is military; and, because the choice of weapons there is so rudimentary, the potential of military power is bound to be mainly manpower.

# ANSWER IS LATIN AMERICA

Where then, is the front on which we would do best to take our stand? And where would our enemy have to stand up to us at the greatest strategic disadvantage? Surely, the answer is Latin America. By contrast with Vietnam, it has been drawn into the orbit of modern economic life, and the issue has been joined there between Castroism and the forces of economic progress and welfare.

Surely, it would be a monumental miscalculation for us to accept Vietnam as our No. 1 fighting front, and then to find ourselves forced to operate from weakness in Latin America. If, instead, we think of Vietnam as a limited and remote holding operation, our imagination, and our know-how toward the kind of Latin American operation

13214

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 13

which we have the power and the will to see through victory.

### PORTLAND STUDENT WINS SCHOLARSHIP

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to invite the attention of Senators to the accomplishment of a young Oregonian, Mr. Franklin Foster, a high school student who will be graduating from Jefferson High School in Portland, Oreg., this month. I am very proud that this young Negro has brought such an honor to Jefferson High School and to Oregon.

Mr. Foster, who is the stepson of a janitor, has been awarded a \$12,000 scholarship which will enable him to undertake his collegiate work at Princeton University. I thoroughly concur in the comments made by the principal of Jefferson High School, Mr. Roy O. Malo, when he said:

This is a singular honor for Frank, but one which he merits from every standpoint—scholarship, leadership, citizenship, and strength of character.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article under the byline of Mr. Jim Running, education editor of the Oregon Journal, concerning Mr. Foster printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal]

PORTLANDER AWARDED SCHOLARSHIP TO PRINCETON VALUED AT \$12,000

(By Jim Running)

The stepson of a janitor will attend Princeton University next fall on one of the biggest scholarships ever given to a Portland high school student.

The student is Franklin David Foster, 8842 Northeast 10th Avenue, who will be graduated from Jefferson next month.

The scholarship and other aid granted by the university totals \$12,000.

"A singular honor for Frank, but one which he merits from every standpoint—scholarship, leadership, citizenship, and strength of character," Jefferson Principal Roy O. Malo said.

Two other universities—Stanford and Oregon State—also competed for Foster with offers of scholarships, but he chose the New Jersey school.

At Princeton, the Nation's fourth oldest college, and a school without fraternities, the youth will live in a dormitory as do nearly all the students, freshmen through seniors.

The scholarship is for \$2,400 the first year for tuition and partial living expenses. To pay his expenses further, the university will give him a job paying \$400 for the year, and will loan him \$200.

If his performance in his freshman and succeeding years is satisfactory, the \$3,000 in aid will be granted as well in his sophomore, junior and senior years.

Franklin's father, Nelson Foster, died in 1948. His mother, Mrs. Helen Brown, is head cook at a convalescent home. His stepfather, Leo Brown, is custodian for the Portland School District.

The youth is one of eight children. Sisters Patty and Shirley attend Woodlawn Grade School. His five older brothers are married, living in Tacoma, Portland and Germany.

Asked to describe Franklin, his Jefferson counselor says, "One is pressed to avoid superlatives.

"Frank Foster is a tremendous young man, always pleasant and cheerful, keen and alert, well-groomed, highly respected, immediately and enduringly liked by all the students, teachers, administrators, and adults with whom he comes in contact.

"As a citizen and participant in classroom, student activity, and homelife, Frank stands out and brings to any individual or group task he enters that special 'Foster' mark of inquisitiveness, easy humor, and dedication to the task of completion."

An honor student at Jefferson, Foster was president of his junior class and the National Honor Society chapter.

His hobbies are chess, fishing, book collecting, student government, and reading.

"Biology is one of his big interests, as is choral music," his counselor said. "He spent 4 years in Jefferson's senior choir, in addition to taking a cluster of honors courses in math, science, and English."

### EDUCATION—OUR BEST CAPITAL INVESTMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the value to all the people of the United States which results from giving student aid to its young people has frequently been a source of speculation. Many are convinced that the education of the human material resources of our young people should be considered as a capital investment which returns tangible benefits both to the individual and to the community.

I invite the attention of Senators to a short but incisive, and to my mind, an unanswerable analysis of the problem prepared by Dean Richard Wynn, of the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Wynn has illustrated most persuasively the case that education is a high yield investment and I commend his cogent analysis to Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the analysis to which I have referred printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EDUCATION—OUR BEST CAPITAL INVESTMENT  
(By Richard Wynn, Associate Dean, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh)

Benjamin Franklin observed that "an investment in knowledge always pays the best interest." But somehow we have consistently failed to grasp the truth of this simple but powerful idea. We continue to regard the costs of education as a levy upon our pocketbooks, a charge against tax revenues. We need to see the cost of education as a high-yield investment, an opportunity to capitalize graduates' future earnings just as we develop capital on future earnings of our corporations.

Consider this dramatic illustration of the concept of education as capital investment. The U.S. Government could make a neat profit by providing for every capable young man a free college education including total

subsidy of tuition, fees, books, room, board, and personal expenses. Here is how it would work.

1. Lifetime income of males with college education.....	\$419, 871
2. Lifetime income of males with high school education.....	\$241, 844
3. Difference in lifetime income (No. 1 minus No. 2).....	\$178, 027
4. Average annual income of male college graduates (No. 1 divided by 40 years).....	\$10, 497
5. Average annual income of male high school graduates No. 2 divided by 40 years).....	\$6, 046
6. Average annual income tax paid by male college graduates.....	\$1, 693
7. Average annual income tax paid by male high school graduates.....	\$676
8. Average lifetime income tax paid by male college graduates (No. 6 multiplied by 40 years).....	\$67, 730
9. Average lifetime income tax paid by male high school graduates (No. 7 multiplied by 44 years).....	\$29, 744
10. Difference in lifetime income tax payments of male college graduates over male high school graduates (No. 8 minus No. 9).....	\$37, 986
11. Estimated total cost of 4-year college education paid by Government.....	\$10, 000
12. Profit to U.S. Government (No. 10 minus No. 11).....	\$27, 986
13. Annual profit to U.S. Government (No. 12 divided by 40 years).....	\$699. 65
14. Rate of income on investment (No. 13 divided by \$10,000) (percent).....	7
15. Interest rate on money borrowed by Government to provide full scholarships (percent).....	5
16. Rate of net profit to U.S. Government (No. 14 minus No. 15) (percent).....	2

The additional profits yielded from the by-products of this investment—increased productivity of the national economy and lower social security payments, to mention a few—would be enormous. Can this country afford to give all its able young men a college education? It can hardly afford not to.

#### DOCUMENTATION AND EXPLANATION OF DATA

1. Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1962, table 150, p. 119. Income of males 25 to 64 years of age in 1958. Includes income of males with more than 4 years college education.

2. Source: Ibid.

4, 5. Divisor of 40 represents age span 25 to 64 for data in 1 and 2.

6, 7. Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1962, table 516, p. 393.

8, 9. Multipliers of 40 and 44 represent estimated years of gainful employment for college males and high school males respectively estimated from mortality rates, Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1962, table 64, p. 61 and corrected for estimate of years of employment beyond age 65.

10. Data based upon figures for 1958, the latest year for which such information is available. The figure for 1963 would probably be greater.

11. Generous estimate of the average total cost of a 4-year college education in 1963.

### THE CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF CENTRAL OREGON COLLEGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the great attributes of our American

Unfortunately this proposal cannot be applied with profit to female college students because the difference in earnings between female college graduates and female high school graduates is smaller than for males.